



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
08/602,272	02/16/1996	MICHAEL J. ELLIOTT	KIR96-01	4297

7590 12/17/2002

JOHN P. WHITE, ESQ. COOPER & DUNHAM  
1185 AVENUE OF THE AMERICAS  
NEW YORK, NY 10036

EXAMINER

CANELLA, KAREN A

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
1642	36

DATE MAILED: 12/17/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Advisory Action</b>	Application No. <b>08/602,272</b>	Applicant(s) <b>Elliott et al</b>
	Examiner <b>Karen Canella</b>	Art Unit <b>1642</b>

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED Sep 3, 2002 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid the abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.

THE PERIOD FOR REPLY [check only a) or b)]

a)  The period for reply expires 3 months months from the mailing date of the final rejection.

b)  The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

1.  A Notice of Appeal was filed on Oct 29, 2002. Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.

2.  The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:

- (a)  they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
- (b)  they raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
- (c)  they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
- (d)  they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: \_\_\_\_\_

3.  Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):  
none

4.  Newly proposed or amended claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).

5.  The a)  affidavit, b)  exhibit, or c)  request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:  
See attached

6.  The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.

7.  For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a)  will not be entered or b)  will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: none

Claim(s) objected to: none

Claim(s) rejected: 6, 8, 10, 12-15, 29-32, and 34-37

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: 16-28 and 38-50

8.  The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is a)  approved or b)  disapproved by the Examiner.

9.  Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_.

10.  Other: \_\_\_\_\_

Art Unit: 1642

***Response to Arguments***

1. Applicant has reiterated arguments that the cited references do not anticipate all the embodiments of the claimed invention. The examiners position is that the claimed method is inherent in the prior art methods. In response to applicant's arguments against the references individually, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.*, 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986).
2. Applicant has provided Exhibit A, B and C which set forth the definitions of thromboembolism, thrombosis and thrombus, respectively, in order to obviate the prior art rejections. The definition of thromboembolism set forth in Exhibit A is "the blocking of a blood vessel by a particle that has broken away from a blood clot at its site of formation". The definition of thrombosis set forth in Exhibit B is "the formation or presence of a blood clot within a blood vessel during life". The definition of thrombus set forth in Exhibit C is "a clot of blood formed within a blood vessel and remaining attached to its place of origin". These definitions have been considered but do not obviate the prior art rejections because it is well known in the art that the presence of a thrombus is dangerous as it may become dislodged and be carried with the blood to a smaller vessel, thereby becoming a thromboembolism and blocking the circulation to a vital organ.

Art Unit: 1642

3. Applicant further argues that a mechanically-induced myocardial infarction in a rat does not lead to an increased risk of thromboembolisms. This has been considered but not found persuasive as it is well known in the art that patients suffering from myocardial infarction are at a great risk of developing a thromboembolism because a damaged heart compromises blood circulation, disposing patients to formation of thrombi, which leads to an increased risk of thromboembolism.

4. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Karen Canella whose telephone number is (703) 308-8362. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 8:30 am to 6:00 pm. A message may be left on the examiner's voice mail service. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Anthony Caputa, can be reached on (703) 308-3995. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0196.

  
Karen A. Canella, Ph.D.

Patent Examiner, Group 1642

December 7, 2002